**From:** Mccray, Sean-Ryan CTR (USA) [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=B8349167BB194B8DA45DBABDB46684DB-SEAN-RYAN.M]
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 2, 2020 11:50 AM
**To:** Bercik, Lisa M. [lisa.bercik@aptim.com]
**CC:** Egan, Jamie [Jamie.Egan@jacobs.com]
**Subject:** FW: Review on Draft Final Rad. Scoping Survey Report Parcel F Structures - Finger Pens, HPNS
**Attachments:** HPNS_Parcel_F_Draft_Final_Submarine_Scoping_Survey_Report_Comment-12-2-2020-signed.pdf

Lisa,

Attached you'll find the Parcel F Draft Final for the Submarine Pen Scoping Surveys. Nina has updated the memo to reflect the correct "Sub Pens" Scoping Surveys rather than the "Finger Piers" which was previously submitted.

Thanks!

SR

---

**From:** Bacey, Juanita@DTSC <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 2, 2020 11:45 AM
**To:** Mccray, Sean-Ryan CTR (USA) <sean-ryan.mccray.ctr@navy.mil>
**Cc:** Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>; Amy.Brownell@sfdph.org
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] FW: Review on Draft Final Rad. Scoping Survey Report Parcel F Structures - Finger Pens, HPNS

Hi Sean-Ryan,
Attached is the corrected comment memo from CDPH on the draft final submarine scoping survey.

Nina

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
California Department of Public Health

SANDRA SHEWRY, MPH, MSW
*Acting Director*

GAVIN NEWSOM
*Governor*

**DATE:** December 2, 2020

**TO:** Juanita Bacey
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program
Department of Toxic Substances Control
700 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94710-2721

**FROM:** Sheetal Singh
Environmental Program Manager
Emergency, Restoration & Waste Management Section
Environmental Management Branch (EMB)
California Department of Public Health (CDPH)
1725 23rd Street, Suite 110
Sacramento, California 95816

**SUB:** CDPH-EMB review of *Draft Final Radiological Scoping Survey Report Parcel F Structures—Submarine Pens,* Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, CA. Received October 26th, 2020.

As submitted by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Environmental Management Branch (EMB) of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) reviewed the *Draft Final Radiological Scoping Survey Report Parcel F Structures—Submarine Pens* Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco for radiological issues. This review was performed in support of the Interagency Agreement between DTSC and CDPH.

If you need further assistance, please contact Terry Han of my staff at (916) 210-8531 or via email at Terry.Han@cdph.ca.gov.

Activity: Review Response to Comments for *Draft Final Radiological Scoping Survey Report Parcel F Structures—Submarine Pens,* Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, CA. Received October 26, 2020.

December 2, 2020 

---

The Environmental Management Branch (EMB) of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) appreciates the opportunity to review response to comments (RTCs), *Draft Final Radiological Scoping Survey Report Parcel F Structures—Submarine Pens,* Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, CA. Received October 26, 2020.

**General Comments:**

1. Navy's response to CDPH General Comment #2 is not sufficient. CDPH would like Navy to be informed, and acknowledge, that CDPH will not consider the alpha scan survey data presented in this scoping report for any evaluating unrestricted release related to the submarine pens structure in Parcel F, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. CDPH understands the alpha scan data is to support for the decision to perform additional investigations of the submarine pens and as input to the design of future investigations. However, due to the alpha scan minimum detection concentration (MDC) being higher than the release criteria, CDPH believes the alpha scan sensitivity did not meet the survey objective for the scoping survey and should not be used for any report in the future.

**New Comments:**

2. To assist our review process, please provide the following information related to the calculation of scan MDC. CDPH understands the difference between observed alpha scan MDC and the expected alpha scan MDC is mostly attributed to the higher background count rates. However, CDPH is unable to replicate the MDC results in Table 4 using the parameters in Table 4, input values listed in section 3.4.4, and the equation listed in section 3.4.4. Please provide:

    **a.** the source of the equation listed in section 3.4.4, and

    **b.** the detailed steps of calculation for the MDCs in Table 4, including the values for every input parameters of the MDC equation in section 3.4.4. In addition, please provide one example of MDC calculation for alpha surface scan (sequential six-second static counts) on concrete, one example of MDC calculation for beta surface scan on concrete, and one example of MDC calculation for alpha static measurements on concrete.